LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

Editor: R. Palme Dutt

The Great Debate

R.P.D.

Trade Unions on the Move

H. PURCELL

The Pakistan Trial

D. N. PRITT, K.C.

August, 1951

Price: One Shilling

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'CELEBRATE EACH MONTH . . .'

On page 376 there will be found an important Editorial Board statement about the forthcoming change in price, of particular importance to those readers who have been driving for new readers. And how they seized on the splendid July Birthday number! Many spoke to me about how strikingly the covers' design expressed the fighting quality and international character of the magazine. (Two-colour prints from the original drawing, much enlarged, will soon be available for framing, at 1s. Order now.) There were wonderful birthday letters from all kinds of readers everywhere. A typical handful of these lie before me, some from readers of the first issue; among them a miner, an engineer, a textile worker, a retired colliery manager and a Marxist teacher, associate of John MacLean, who writes: '*Labour Monthly* deserves a celebration every month instead of one in thirty years, because of its informed articles and Marxist interpretation. My thanks for 30 years of the finest monthly in Britain'. Particularly from active workers in the Labour Party came many letters of thanks. 'I have been a constant reader for many years. Even you, perhaps, don't realise what a tremendous contribution it has made for a large number of people. In times to come it will be ranked, not only as a brilliant journalistic achievement, but also an indispensable instrument in the struggle for a Socialist Britain'. From London: 'There isn't a finer journal published. For the last 15 years I have looked forward to the stimulus of the Notes and have never been disappointed'. Finally from Scotland, a former I.L.P.er and propagandist for women's rights: 'When I first became a socialist, my first reaction was a sense of indignation at the injustice and cruelty of the present order; how it was to be changed I had yet to learn. I personally owe so much to *L.M.* during these 30 years. It cleared the mind of so many of us of the sentimental garbage upon which we had been fed for years. What tremendous progress has been made throughout the world! It's good to be alive these days and to see the new order nearer. The international character of the workers' struggle has been kept ever before us in *L.M.* The anniversary number is beyond price'. From Lancashire: 'Nothing that has been written by more famous and distinguished writers than myself has been too good. To those of us who have read *L.M.* from its first issue it has been actually a part of our lives. I have read the various articles, not always fully understanding them, sometimes in decided disagreement with them but always to my benefit. . . May *Labour Monthly* outlive us all both in years and usefulness'.

All through these birthday letters runs the theme: What a tremendous effect an ever-increasing circulation must have! We here understand full well that yet another extra sixpence to be found means a headache for many readers; even now old age pensioners often can no longer afford their own copy, but must toil out to the public library to read it. And I know two engineers who have to share one subscription, taking it in turns to have first go. Indeed, there must be few magazines with so many readers per copy.

Continued on inside back cover.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXXIII, No. 8

CONTENTS

August, 1951

	Page
NOTES OF THE MONTH: The Great Debate, by R.P.D.	353
TRADE UNIONS ON THE MOVE: by Henry Purcell	367
NEW CHINA AS I SAW IT: by Arthur Clegg	370
AN IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT	376
THE PAKISTAN TRIAL: by D. N. Pritt, K.C.	379
FRANKFURT 'INTERNATIONAL': by John Gollan	382
OPEN LETTER TO A JOURNALIST IN WEST BERLIN: by John Peet	386
MESSAGES OF GREETING: from S. O. Davies, M.P., Howard Fast, Sam Kahn, D. N. Pritt, K.C., Paul Robeson and overseas contemporaries	389
DOCUMENT OF THE MONTH	394
Book Reviews:	
Soviets in Central Asia, by W.P. and Z. Coates: *C.P.D.*	397
Report to the Second Congress of the Hungarian Working People's Party, by Matyas Rakosi: *Bob Stewart*	399
People's Democratic Dictatorship, by Mao Tse-tung: *M. Ramelson*	399
Shorter Notices	400

Notes of the Month

The Great Debate

There is a danger that relaxation in Korea in the next few weeks will revive the old fond hope that what is called a 'general settlement' with the rulers of Russia is possible in a matter of months.

Economist, July 14, 1951.

Sudden peace could work havoc with business.

New York Times, May 20, 1951.

A NEW situation has opened since the Soviet peace initiative led the way to the cease fire negotiations in Korea. Not peace yet, but the hope and vision of peace is stirring humanity in all countries. Hopes —and fears—of peace are expressed on all sides. Hopes from the millions in all countries who are sick of the cold war, of endless privation for destructive weapons, of casualties and bombing devastation, and of the lowering menace of atomic war to blast the future. Fears from the tiny handful of financiers and war leaders who have built the entire economy and political structure of the Western

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world on soaring rearmament, local wars of aggression, strategic calculations, American subsidies and domination, and offensive preparations for a third world war. The Great Debate has begun. Not the 'Great Debate' of the American Senate, between rival sections of the war camp, between the MacArthur school of immediate general war and the Bradley school of 'the right war against the right enemy at the right place at the right time'. But the Great Debate, which is centred above all in Britain and in the British labour movement, between the people and the war leaders.

Rearmament Controversy

There is alarm in the war camp lest popular opinion get out of hand and turn against the war policy. Warning after warning is solemnly issued from the war leaders, from the Attlees, Churchills and Morrisons (now in daily consultation), and the *Daily Herald* leader-writers, that there must be no relaxation in the arms drive, that there must be further cuts in living standards and social services, that the Moloch of 'Western Civilisation' requires new human sacrifices, and the faithful flock must not let their gaze wander to the green pastures of peace and prosperity or to the rising standards and falling prices of the lands of socialism and popular democracy. Discontent is increased, rather than allayed, by these pontifical exhortations. A section of the former war leadership has broken away to demand a slightly diminished figure of rearmament, even though so far with a continuance of the basic policy of the Anglo-American Alliance, the Atlantic Pact, the atom bomb bases in Britain and anti-Soviet hostility. This demand is vigorously denounced by all Tory and official Labour expression. Thereby the issue of the rearmament programme is forced into the forefront of the arena of public discussion. But the issue of the rearmament programme is in fact the choice of war or peace. Once this question is publicly raised, no longer only in the obscurity of constituency labour parties and trade union branch resolutions, but at the top levels of official controversy, with all the organs of the millionaire press thundering denunciation of any challenge to the sacred rearmament programme, the discussion is likely to go very much further than the group of ex-Ministers may intend. The Great Debate has come into the open.

The Iron is Hot

It is not the resignation of Ministers or the publication of a pamphlet that has produced the crisis. It is the crisis that has produced the resignation of Ministers and the publication of a pamphlet. The

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deep currents of feelings below have begun to make their impact above. Millions of workers are stirring against the consequences of the rearmament programme, the rising prices and worsened conditions. Increasing numbers are beginning to question the policies which are producing this outcome. The rift in the upper leadership is only a reflection—even though still a distorting and belated reflection—of the mighty voice of millions of trade unionists at recent conferences demanding in various forms negotiations for peace, a peace settlement, reduction of armaments, a Five Power Pact, and improved social conditions. The tide of the demand for peace is rising. This does not mean that the menace of war is receding. On the contrary. The menace of war is also rising—for there is no change in policy yet. But the greatest opportunity is now opening out, with the beginning of negotiations in Korea, and with the new political stirrings in Britain, to mobilise majority opinion in order to halt the war offensive, check any attempt at wrecking the Korea negotiations, ensure a settlement in the Far East, and press forward to the supreme aim of a general settlement, embodied in a Five Power Pact and the all-round reduction of armaments. It is to these positive aims that the present universal aspirations for peace need to be directed, if they are to become effective. Only such a policy can clear the road for social improvement in Britain.

Who Is For Peace?

Lenin said in 1915, writing on 'The Peace Question' at the height of the first world war, to warn against the deceptiveness of the slogan of 'peace in general':

> Absolutely everybody is in favour of peace in general, including Kitchener, Joffre, Hindenburg and Nicholas the Bloody, for every one of them wishes to end the war.

In this sense Truman, Churchill, Attlee, Morrison, Marshall and Eisenhower are all 'in favour of peace'—as they proclaim in every speech, repudiating with indignation the calumny that they are warmongers. All they want is overwhelming military power, with their guns and bombers trained on the Soviet Union on every frontier, in order then to have what they call a 'showdown' with the Soviet Union, that is, to impose their terms of peace by superior military strength—'peace through strength', as they describe it. 'The Western Powers have got to be strong . . . they have got to be clear as to the kind of world they want, and stand for it until they get it', in the words of the late Ernest Bevin. It is obvious that this kind of aim of 'peace'—the aim of 'peace through strength' to enable 'the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Western Powers' to impose ' the kind of world they want ' by superior military strength—would have been called in more old-fashioned language the aim of offensive war. This is the aim of the rearmament programme. And this is the crux of the question of the rearmament programme.

Rearmament—For What ?

The question of the rearmament programme is not a simple arithmetical question of a particular figure—' think of a figure ', ' double it ', ' halve it '. It is the question of the *policy* and *purpose* for which the rearmament is demanded. Why do the leaders of the Western Powers demand a gigantic further increase in the already enormous excess of their armaments over those of the Soviet Union and its allies, at the same time as the Soviet Union has demobilised and embarked on no rearmament programme? Why does the United States Government, which is already spending sixty times the pre-war level on armaments, declare a steep further increase essential for a hypothetical war against the Soviet Union, at the same time as the Soviet Union has alone decreased its arms expenditure below the pre-war level? The ' United States News and World Report ' on May 25 proudly boasted:

> America's armed strength is the world's greatest today. . . United States power dominates sea and air. . . As of now, the United States is the world's dominant military power.

Why, then, does ' the world's dominant military power ', ringed round with mighty armed powers as its satellites, profess to go in terror of its life (just as Hitler used to do) from less armed powers, and proclaim as essential to its security to increase still further its rearmament and impose crushing burdens of rearmament on its satellites? The proposition does not make sense, if the purpose were only defensive. But the proposition is completely comprehensible, as soon as it is understood that the purpose (often proclaimed with brutal frankness by the strategic chiefs) is *offensive* war. In the words of the U.S. Navy Secretary Matthews in his speech at Boston on August 26, 1950 (the terms of which had been previously approved by the Secretary of Defence Johnson):

> The initiation of a war of aggression would win for us a proud and popular title—we would become the first aggressor for peace.

No Illusions

There is no room for illusions that, because the Soviet initiative for the cease-fire negotiations in Korea has had to be accepted, and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the failure of the original aggressive aims of the American invasion of Korea for the conquest of the whole of Korea, as set out in the illegal United Nations resolution of October 7, 1950, has to this extent had to be recognised, therefore the wider aggressive aims of the leaders of the American war machine and their associates have been abandoned, or that even a peace settlement in Korea can be regarded as assured. On the contrary, this rebuff has intensified their frenzy, to raise still higher their armaments and strike elsewhere. At the same time as they negotiate in Korea (and angry voices in the United States already demand the wrecking of these negotiations), they have broken off the Four Power negotiations in Europe on the grounds of refusing even to discuss the illegal Atlantic War Pact and their offensive bases in Europe. They press forward the rearmament of Western Germany and Japan. They bring forward the American Draft 'Peace' Treaty for Japan, to make Japan their war base, with unlimited rearmament and permanent American military occupation, alongside their military hold on Formosa and maintaining of Chiang Kai-shek's army, for the resumption of their war in the Far East. They draw Franco into the American War Bloc by the new agreement to establish offensive bases in Spain and to supply finance and arms to bolster up fascist dictatorship against Spanish democracy.

Panic Fear of Peace

While President Truman sends his Note of milk and honey to the Soviet Union to proclaim his desire for 'trust and friendship' and for 'communications to flow free and open across international boundaries', he simultaneously cancels the trade treaties with the Soviet Union, uses his West German puppet police to prevent with violence the passage of tens of thousands of young people of West Germany to cross the artificial boundary to join their brothers of East Germany and of all countries in the great World Youth Festival for peace, and refuses entry to the delegates of the World Peace Council, representing eight hundred millions, to present their proposals for peace to the United Nations. New naval and military aggression is threatened against Persia, and has only been held off so far, partly because of Anglo-American rivalries, and mainly because, as the war leaders themselves admit, by the 1921 Treaty the Soviet Union stands on guard for the protection of Persian freedom, and the war leaders hesitate yet to attempt this major provocation. Every speech of every Government leader in America,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain and the associated Atlantic countries clamours for intensified war preparations and thunders against any relaxation. The financial and stock exchange press, that final sacred oracle of the shrine of the Western Way of Life, completes the chorus with panic prophecies of collapse if peace should break out.

A Victory for Peace

Nevertheless, the opening of the cease-fire negotiations in Korea, whatever their further outcome may prove, does already represent a victory for peace. It does represent a rebuff to the expansionist aims of the American aggressors for the conquest of the whole of Korea. It may yet prove a historic turning point in the whole world situation, if the peoples of all countries rise to the opportunity which now opens out. Ten months ago the United States Commander-in-Chief proclaimed his insolent ultimatum for the unconditional surrender of the Korean people:

> To the Commander-in-Chief, North Korean forces: The early and total defeat and complete destruction of your armed forces and warmaking potential is now inevitable. . . I as the United Nations Commander-in-Chief call upon you and the forces under your command, in whatever part of Korea situated, forthwith to lay down your arms and cease hostilities under such military supervision as I may direct.

Today General MacArthur is retired in disgrace. Kim Ir Sen leads the unvanquished Korean people. Ten months ago the Anglo-American bloc in control of the United Nations voted the resolution for the conquest and subjugation of all Korea to the Yalu, that is, for the destruction of the Korean People's Republic. Today the representatives of the Korean People's Republic meet the arrogant American generals as equals. The Herrenvolk Yankees have to learn to curb their tongues and exercise the forms of politeness with the 'gooks'. It is a demonstration that will not be lost on Asia and the world.

Not In Vain

The world bully has been taught a lesson. It is a lesson that has cost dear. It has not only cost the needless waste of lives of American, British and other youth shipped from their homes to invade Korea. It has cost the blood and suffering of millions of Koreans and the limitless devastation of their country at the hands of the American barbarians and vandals, as well as the lives of Chinese volunteer fighters for freedom. To them the peoples of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the world owe an irreparable debt. It is for us all to see that their sacrifice shall reap its full harvest. The example of the hell of devastation of Korea has taught the world what the modern American gangster super-Nazi methods of war mean, and what fate awaits the peoples of all countries if they do not stand together for independence and for peace. The example of the Korean people, who have looked into the jaws of hell and not quailed, has taught something to the peoples, not only of Asia and Africa, but of many so-called 'advanced' countries, including the British working class (whose leaders still impress upon them the 'inevitability' of bowing to the almighty dollar—'Britain's post-war association with the United States was in fact inevitable', as the *Tribune* pamphlet says), how to straighten their backs and stand up for their national independence and for peace.

Strategic Miscalculations

The struggle of the Korean people and the Chinese volunteers has not only saved the future of Korea. It has also struck a powerful blow for world peace. For it has halted the aggressors and invaders. It has taught them that aggression and invasion, even by the most formidable coalition of all the super-armed imperialist Powers against one small ill-equipped nation, does not pay and can never finally succeed in the modern world. David stood up to Goliath, and Goliath has not conquered. The Korean War of Independence has exposed in a microcosm the profound strategic miscalculation of the protagonists of the third world war. All the war leaders of the American bloc, of the imperialist Powers, like Hitler before them, like the Nazi generals and the Japanese generals, place their confidence in overwhelming superiority of material equipment, of arms and weapons of destruction, in 'reeking tube and iron shard', in military terror. The Atom Bomb as the invincible weapon of Western civilisation, worshipped by the Churchills and Trumans. Air power to darken the skies. Super-battleships to bombard and shell. Piling up of armaments upon armaments. Also the *Tribune* pamphlet falls a victim to the same basic error when it adds up the figures of steel and petroleum to prove the invincible superiority of the Atlantic Alliance of the imperialist Powers in war. In all these calculations the omniscient strategists of imperialism forget one thing. They forget people. They forget that wars are finally decided by people. Korea has reminded them of that truth.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From Fiasco to Fiasco

When the Nazi blitzkrieg was let loose on the Soviet Union, all the military and political experts of imperialism, not merely all the Nazi experts, but all the British military and political experts, all the American military experts, were convinced that the Soviet Union would be smashed in six weeks. But it was Hitler and Nazism that was smashed, and the Soviet people and socialism that triumphed. The lesson was not learned. The American General Staff has succeeded to the Nazi illusion on a yet more megalomaniac and destructive scale. When the first major American expansionist military adventure was let loose in the War of Intervention through Chiang Kai-shek in China in 1946-49, at the outset all the material and numerical advantages, all the superiority of guns and tanks and planes and equipped armies and billions of dollars were on the side of Chiang Kai-shek (armed forces of 4,300,000 with the most modern artillery and planes and equipment of six billion dollars, American military missions to guide them and planes to transport them, and a rich territory of 300 million inhabitants, against 1,200,000 of the People's Liberation Army in one quarter of the territory of China). Yet it was the Chinese People's Republic that conquered and drove the hated Chiang Kai-shek to cower under American naval guns in the island of Taiwan.

Warning for the Future

Still the lesson was not learned. The fiasco in China inflamed the frenzy of the American militarists. Smarting for revenge, they entered on the ill-fated Japanese path of conquest, and in 1950 let loose all their forces and the forces of their satellites on the tiny Korean nation. Today the American General Staff have concentrated their main front line fighting forces, no less than 420,000 United States troops (300,000 military, 60,000 naval, 60,000 air—*United States News and World Report,* July 6, 1951), together with conscripted South Koreans and extorted forces of all their imperialist satellites, against the one small country of Korea. Yet they have not been able to subjugate the Korean people. Not without reason the thought must strike them: if this is the outcome of the war of the whole Atlantic Grand Alliance against one small free people, what is the prospect for their future megalomaniac plans of the third World War against eight hundred millions, led by the mighty socialist power of the Soviet Union, who will never let their dearly won freedom be taken from them? The Korean War of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Independence has given cause to the protagonists of the third world war to think and think again before embarking on new adventures.

Contradictions in the War Camp

The Korean War of Independence has stirred the conscience of the peoples of the world against the menace of American military expansion and military barbarism. At the same time the frenzy of the rearmament drive has given rise to new factors in the situation which further complicate the path of the warmakers and give new opportunities in the fight for peace to halt the fatal course before it is too late. The rearmament drive is disorganising the economy of the capitalist world, even while it is proclaimed the magic panacea to bolster up business and mounting profits against the spectre of crisis. This is most powerfully shown in the raw materials crisis. All the contradictions of the rival capitalist interests, of imperialist antagonisms, of the conflict of imperialism and the colonial world, and of class antagonisms, are brought to the forefront. The sharp rifts of American and British interests beneath the mantle of partnership force themselves into view in relation to the Far East, Japan, China, the Colombo Plan, the Schuman Plan, and most conspicuously at the moment in relation to Persia, oil and the Middle East. The Edens and the Salisburys clamour for a stronger stand irrespective of American policy; the Churchills and Beaverbrooks and Morrisons, while mobilisation for eventual military action is prepared, counsel caution until America is squared; and meanwhile against both the struggle of the Persian people rises.

How They Love One Another

The British monopolists howl against the American monopolists 'hogging' the raw materials of the world and ruining British industry and the British balance of payments. The American monopolists reply in kind through the mouth of Eric Johnston, Economic Stabilisation Administrator, who recommended to the Senate Banking Committee on May 15 that

> the United States should take retaliatory steps against those allies who, he said, were 'gouging' her by charging exorbitant prices for vital materials.
>
> 'We have a few aces in our hand, too', he said. 'We are not at a loss for cards'. The United States could buy up other raw materials in the world market, and then charge her allies enough to make up the extra amount the Americans now had to pay for such essential materials as rubber and tin. (*The Times*, May 16, 1951.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

While the monopolists conduct their battles across the globe with the means of life, the people pay. Indians die of starvation; the Soviet and Chinese peoples rush food to them across the frontiers; the American monopolists haggle and bargain and delay in order to use the opportunity for blackmail to tighten their grip on strategic raw materials. Inflation rages throughout the capitalist world. All the burdens of the rearmament drive fall on the common people, and make a mockery of Labour promises.

Britain in the Vortex

Britain—precisely because Britain is the oldest capitalist imperialist Power, now in deep decline—stands at the centre of all these contradictions and receives all their blows. The success of United States strategy since the end of the war to keep Britain and the Soviet Union apart—when their close association, as the British-Soviet Treaty set out, could alone have saved Europe and progressive interests throughout the world—has reduced Britain to deepening economic and political dependence on the United States. First, infinite sacrifices were imposed on the British people to meet the dollar shortage and achieve a precarious balance of payments, mainly by intensified colonial exploitation. Now the balance of payments is knocked to pieces by the American-imposed rearmament and the raw materials crisis which is integrally bound up with rearmament and the American expansionist economic and military aims. The first half of 1951 shows an adverse trade balance running at an annual rate of £1,109 million, or treble the rate of 1950; the small surplus on the balance of payments in 1950 has been brought back to a deficit whose extent is not yet estimated. New and heavier sacrifices are demanded of the British people, and make themselves felt in astronomically rising prices. Austerity Cripps is succeeded by Misery Morrison and Gloomy Gaitskell. Therefore it is no matter for surprise that the stirring of discontent deepens throughout the labour movement, and reveals itself equally in the trade unions and on the political front.

The Tocsin and the Sluggards

Six years ago, in November, 1945, the Communist Party at its Congress gave the warning prediction:

> We warn the labour movement that unless it compels the Government to change completely its present foreign policy, which is simply the continuation of the imperialist line of the Tory Party and the reactionary

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

monopoly capitalists, there can be no fundamental social progress in Britain, and that the whole future of this country is in grave peril.

And again in June, 1946:

Antagonism to Communism and dependence on American capitalism, instead of friendship with the Soviet Union and the democratic countries of Europe, can only result in the betrayal of the programme of social progress for which the country voted at the general election.

Two years ago, in February, 1949, the United States Chief of the Special Mission to the United Kingdom for the E.C.A., Thomas K. Finletter, reported to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with satisfaction on the success of his policy in Britain:

The housing programme has been quite seriously cut back. So has the health programme, and so has the programme for education.

Today, in June, 1951, President Truman proclaims the new orders:

U.S. EXPECTS . . .
BRITISH SACRIFICES FOR DEFENCE

Washington, June 25.

President Truman said in a Message to Congress today that Britain was expected to have to curtail social services and other civilian benefits—'in spite of criticism by some members of the Labour Party'—because of her greatly increased defence effort.

(*Manchester Guardian*, June 26, 1951—titles as in the original.)

At last, after six years, two prominent Cabinet Ministers of the Labour Government (together with a third Minister), who have borne during all these six years the heavy responsibility for the policies which have led to this disastrous outcome, have resigned in protest, and have now endorsed a pamphlet which declares:

The intensification of the Cold War . . . has first halted the advance towards Socialism and then turned it into a retreat. . . Since the Budget, the rich have been growing richer and the poor poorer. Profits are soaring; prices are rising faster than wages; and the real value of pensions and social services is falling as the cost of living rises.

Truth will out.

A Sign of the Times

The appearance of the pamphlet *One Way Only* is an important development of the present political situation. It is important, not because what it has to say is in any degree new, nor because its analysis can be regarded as a contribution to political clarity (its analysis is still choked with all the illusions, legends and prejudices of the past six years), but because it does

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the first time express on the top levels of leadership of the Labour Party some of the criticism and questioning, and the search for an alternative programme, which has developed and is developing among the active rank and file in the trade unions and the Labour Party. It is one thing for Communists and Left critics to assert that American pressure has compelled Government decisions on high policy, and for Government Ministers and the kept press to attempt to laugh off the charge as a fantastic imagination. It is another thing for former Cabinet Ministers, with the authority of direct knowledge, to endorse the same assertion. Truth will out. The pamphlet does not attempt to present an alternative programme. But it does press for some reduction of the rearmament programme (apparently to the previous £3,600 million figure); an attempt to negotiate a settlement with the Soviet Union; a diminution of dependence on the United States; and measures to keep down prices, tax high profits and protect the social services. Insofar as any fight is developed for these objectives, however limited, against the existing dominant right wing and Tory policy, it is certain that such a fight will have the support of very wide sections; and no political differences should stand in the way of such a common fight.

'Facing Both Ways'?

Nevertheless, the central demand to challenge the present figure of the rearmament programme, which has become the main pivot of controversy around the pamphlet, is gravely weakened by the accompanying political analysis, which in practice accepts all the basic assumptions of the war camp—the Atlantic Pact, the American offensive bases in Europe, the Soviet 'menace', the legends of Soviet 'aggression' in Korea or Czechoslovakia, the war in Malaya (Malaya is actually quoted as a shining example of the Labour Government's policy of 'freedom'), the American atom bomb bases in Britain and military occupation of Britain (subject only to British consultation in the use of the atom bomb), and all the rest of it. In short, nothing was wrong until the Ministers resigned in 1951. Return to the Britain of 1950; resume the triumphant march to the nationalisation of sugar and cement in accordance with 'Let Us Win Through Together'; and all will be bliss. But if the basic assumptions of the war camp are accepted, and the necessity of the rearmament programme on this basis agreed, then the 'challenge' to the particular figure of the rearmament

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

programme inevitably dissolves into an abstruse arithmetical-technical discussion on the feasibility of rival astronomical totals. All the apologists of official policy have immediately seized on this inconsistency to make this contradiction at the heart of the pamphlet the main pivot of their criticism: 'Facing Both Ways' (*Manchester Guardian*, July 10); 'Facing Both Ways' (*Daily Herald*, July 13); 'A Foot in Both Camps' (*Daily Telegraph*, July 16). However, this is always the characteristic of the vacillating Centre, which emerges when the right-wing policy and leadership is becoming deeply discredited and Left tendencies are spreading among the masses. The Left must be able to use all the positive opportunities opened by the publication of this pamphlet, following the resignation of the three Ministers, for the enormous broadening of discussion throughout the labour movement, and to help to guide such discussion towards a positive and consistent policy.

Towards An Alternative Programme

The deep stirring among the membership of the trade unions and Labour Party against the consequences of the present disastrous official policy of War and Scarcity, and seeking for an alternative policy for peace and social advance, needs to find expression, not merely in criticism, questioning and discussion, but in a definite challenge to the existing right-wing leadership and policy, and in a positive and concrete programme for the aims of peace, national independence and socialism. The pamphlet endorsed by the three ex-Ministers expressly renounces this task, and emphasises that it is 'in no sense a challenge' to the existing right-wing leadership, and that

> It is not our purpose to put forward a programme for the Government or for the Labour Party.

The tactical reasons compelling this statement, and the very plain and public threats from official quarters preceding it, are known. Nevertheless, it is necessary to challenge the existing right-wing leadership and policy. It is necessary to carry through the fight for an alternative programme. There is still only one alternative programme in the field—*The British Road to Socialism*. The value of this programme is that it does challenge the right-wing policy and does present an alternative. As the political situation still further develops, we can be confident that its proposals will be found to correspond to the aims and desires of ever wider sections

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the labour movement and of popular opinion. What is certain is that the fight cannot be sidestepped. The fight must go forward, on the basis of public agitation and action and the mobilisation of wider and wider mass support, to defeat the present policy of the Government and Toryism, the policy of war and lower standards, and to win the day for a policy of peace, for the Five Power Pact and all-round reduction of armaments, and through this to clear the way to advance to real social change in Britain.

R.P.D.

July 18, 1951.

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY *will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.*

With the alteration in price (see An Important Announcement by the Editorial Board on pages 376-7) there will be consequential changes in subscription rates. This will not affect subscriptions already taken out and as yet unexpired. Further, this special concession will be made up to 31st December, 1951.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES *at 15s. a year in Britain and 16s. overseas, post free. This will apply both to renewal of existing subscriptions and to new subscribers.*

LABOUR MONTHLY BY AIRMAIL.—*To non-European countries (including Hongkong) except as below, post free: Single copy, 3s. 6d.; a year's subscription, 39s.*

To China (except Hongkong), Australia, New Zealand, Japan and the Philippines, post free: Single copy, 4s.; a year's subscription, 45s.

N.B.—Owing to changes in international postal rates, these Airmail figures are valid only for this issue of the magazine.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TRADE UNIONS ON THE MOVE

HENRY PURCELL

VIRTUALLY blanketed by all the newspapers except the *Daily Worker*, a profound change took place this summer in the Trade Union movement. For the first time since 1945 the mass of the industrial workers are refusing slavishly to follow the foreign policy of the Government. Conference after conference has gone on record with resolutions condemning the rearmament of Germany and Japan, demanding trade and friendship with the Soviet Union, China and the New Democracies, calling for the great powers to find a way of settlement through negotiations rather than war.

The grip of the machine on both the Labour Party and the Trades Union Congress is still so strong that for the time being at least, the leaders are able to ignore this growing revolt. But leaders cannot go on indefinitely refusing to hear the voice of the rank and file. They tried to do so last year when the battle-line was drawn over the wage freeze. They relied then on the right wing majority of the Mineworkers' Executive to hold the growing revolt in the coalfields. But the miners forced their leaders to take a ballot and the miners' block vote was swung over against the freeze. In the following months, the various Union conferences piled up the anti-wage freeze votes until by the Trades Union Congress in September the General Council faced certain defeat. At the Labour Party Conference in October, the leaders did not even try to fight. They contented themselves with behind-the-scenes manœuvres to secure a suitably watered down resolution.

This year as the battle develops over foreign policy, the struggle becomes more bitter and less clear-cut, but the results are no less striking. At the Scottish Trades Union Congress where the General Council has a safe right-wing majority, everything was scheduled for a rubber-stamp vote backing Chancellor Gaitskell and endorsing rearmament and the cold war. But the delegates, who unlike those at the British T.U.C. vote individually and not with block votes, soundly defeated the leaders on all issues. They condemned United States interference in British affairs and called for trade and friendship with the countries of the East.

The Electrical Trades Union and the Foundry Workers who for years have been in the forefront of the fight for a progressive policy, came out firmly for a new deal in foreign affairs. The equally em-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

phatic opposition to present policy by the National Union of Railwaymen and the Amalgamated Engineering Union must have produced headaches in both Downing Street and Washington.

The Electrical Trades Union condemned the rearming of Germany and Japan, called for the withdrawal of American troops from Britain, for laws to ban war propaganda and for a united trade union international and supported a Five Power Peace Pact.

The National Union of Foundry Workers voted against re-militarisation of Germany and Japan, against the rearmament, against diplomatic relations with Franco Spain; and for China to be in the United Nations, British troops to be withdrawn from Korea (and also foreign troops from all countries), Atlantic Pact to be included in agenda for four-Power talks, peace and trade with U.S.S.R. and People's Democracies.

The A.E.U. condemned German rearmament, called for a six power peace pact (to include India as well as the five other great powers) and unanimously backed the demand of the Executive for British Government action to send the American troops back home. The N.U.R. condemned German and Japanese rearmament and called on the British Government to convene a conference including People's China in order to call a halt to the arms race and wanted ' an early withdrawal of all foreign forces from the soil of Korea '. At the Mineworkers' conference there was a 'gentlemen's agreement' to avoid open controversy on foreign affairs—a far cry from the previous attitude of uncritical support for the Government. Sir Luke Fawcett (of the T.U.C. General Council) spoke at the National Federation of Building Trades Operatives' Conference of ' labour and resources flung into the bottomless pit of military expenditure '. Even at the General and Municipal Workers' Conference, where an anti-Communist ban operates and the rule book fetters expression of rank and file opinion, there was considerable minority support for a resolution calling on the British Government to adopt ' a more independent approach to foreign affairs '. The Transport and General Workers (also subject to an anti-Communist ban) repudiated Mr. Arthur Deakin's attempt to dismiss foreign policy resolutions under an executive declaration of loyalty to the Government. The subsequent discussions failed to register any forward decisions but the rumblings of revolt were evidence to all. Draughtsmen, firemen, and many other sections have added their voices to the growing opposition.

When the T.U.C. meets in September and subsequently the Labour Party Conference assembles, the Union delegates will have the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duty of assessing their attitude on the various foreign policy questions in the light of their conference decisions. There will be endless wire-pulling both in the delegations and at the standing orders committees to prevent clear cut resolutions being put to the Conferences. Both the Labour Party Executive and the T.U.C. General Council are past masters in the art of producing 'facing both ways' resolutions which serve to conceal the real feelings of the rank and file. But nothing can hide the uneasiness in the minds of millions of loyal Labour Party members and trade unionists, nor can the truth be concealed that the right wing now depends for its support on the votes of unions which have themselves twisted democracy by purges.

It is in this growing movement among the trade unionists of Britain that the Bevan-Wilson resignations and their subsequent pamphlet *One Way Only** have their main significance. Indeed *One Way Only* cannot be understood except when viewed against this background of insistent pressure from below. That pressure is mounting higher. The fight to wrest the control of the machine from reactionary leaders, tied up with a Labour government (which itself is tied up with the reactionaries of the U.S.A.), must go forward. The widespread willingness to sign the Five Power Petition is another index of how the workers feel. The fight to defeat the warmongers and to win peace goes forward—and must go forward, for the whole future depends upon it.

* One passage blows sky high the whole propaganda facade with which the Government conceals its subservience to America. '**One Way Only**' says in effect that on the issue of German rearmament the die-hard U.S. Republicans forced Truman to toe the line and then the British Government, which was violently opposed to the policy, was forced to acquiesce for fear of embarrassing Truman.

The Transport House legend that Truman's America is a 'progressive social democracy' disappears into thin air. Now we know with the authority of men who saw events from the inside that the American reactionaries dictate the policies of a British Labour Government. If it is true about German Rearmament, it must be true about the Foster Dulles Japanese Treaty, about the manœuvres to build a Turkish-Greek-Jugoslav war pact against the New Democracies, about the crippling expenditure on arms.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW CHINA AS I SAW IT

ARTHUR CLEGG

How strong is People's China?

War-crazed Republicans and war-crazed Democrats in the United States and their spokesmen in other countries present her as weak and divided, exhausted by the effort of sending volunteers to Korea, threatened with collapse by the American embargo. The *New York Times* on June 27 editorially found People's China ' pinched by the United States embargo ' and on July 1 wrote:

> Consumer's goods—never plentiful—are disappearing. Taxes on farmers have sharply increased. The programme of rural rehabilitation and industrialisation has had to be postponed. The longer the war (in Korea) continues, the worse the internal situation will become.

Robert Guillain, special correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* and *Le Monde,* who echoes only the opinions of American militarists, two days later from Tokyo claimed to have discovered that the Korean war:

> . . . is certainly very costly for China. It is creating for the new régime growing resistance and increasing discontent at home.

In various forms the theme of China's weakness has been peddled ever since the People's Republic was founded. It was an essential part of the MacArthur propaganda for a great war against China. It is one of the propaganda weapons of those who would tear up the truce in Korea to seek once more for the ' easy victory ' which has hitherto eluded them. Its falsity can be measured by the heavy American losses in Korea. And, using that yardstick, some more responsible journals and political figures are now beginning to discard the picture of China on the point of collapse. But it took over half a million Syngman Rhee, American and British casualties before *The Times* for example discovered as one of the powerful arguments for a truce in Korea that ' the Chinese have shown their power to guard their frontiers '.

I was in China for seven weeks, from the end of April to the middle of June. The American war in Korea was then ten months old or more. The Chinese people's volunteers had been in Korea for about six months. The American boycott on trade with China was five months old when we arrived and the British Government had been intensifying its policy of partial embargo for at

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

least four months. We travelled for a month in the coastal provinces of East China, visiting Shanghai, Hangchow, Nanking and the mining area of Huainan in the Huai river valley. We also visited Tientsin, the chief port of North China. The towns and cities that we visited were those which in the past had depended both on imported raw materials for their industries—cotton, wool, oil, chemicals, etc.; on imported food (rice and wheat) for their inhabitants; and on imported machinery for any industrial expansion that took place. They would therefore be the first places to be hit by an embargo. These areas were also those in which Chiang Kai-shek used to be strongest. Hangchow is the capital of Chekiang. This was Chiang Kai-shek's own province. From Chekiang came the banking family of Chen which started Chiang Kai-shek on his career and financed his betrayal of the Chinese Revolution in 1927. Till the summer of 1949—that is, two years before we were in China—it was the seat of power of the clique of the two Chen brothers—Chen Li-fu and Chen Kuo-fu—who ran the Kuomintang Party and managed its finances and its secret police. Nanking, a few hours' train journey from Hangchow, was Chiang's capital; Shanghai, further down the river than Nanking, was the main theatre of operations of his gangster supporters and of the imperialist financial stranglehold over China of which Chiang was the agent. If 'growing resistance and increasing discontent' were evident anywhere surely one might reasonably expect to see some signs in such an area?

What then was our experience? Every factory without exception which we visited, whether publicly or privately owned, was running to capacity and had exceeded its former output both under the Kuomintang (which was not very difficult) and under the Japanese (a far more difficult task). In Tientsin we visited a paper mill. It was a Japanese-built concern and had been worked to the best of their considerable ability during their occupation of north China from 1937-45. It had been created to use local reed as its raw material, not wood pulp. When the Kuomintang took it over in 1945 it was still in running order more or less. But Chiang Kai-shek's appointed manager let machines break down and did little to repair them. Production fell and the whole factory was going to pieces by degrees. It was easier and more profitable for Chiang to rely on American and Canadian newsprint. But when we saw it, it was in full production. Output in the first three months of this

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

year was 105 per cent. of peak production under the Japanese. Machines which had not worked for years were now running again, having been repaired by the workers and technicians.

The story of the textile mills was similar. Under Chiang they had depended to a great extent on imported cotton, largely American. Now they were running on China-grown cotton. Last year, for the first time in history, China had a cotton crop almost sufficient to supply all her own mills. This year, unless any great natural disaster should occur, there will be quite enough. As a result of the American embargo there may be a close down of a week or two in the Tientsin mills before the new cotton crop becomes available, but nothing more. What the People's Government has accomplished in the cotton industry in the little space of eighteen months is hardly short of a miracle. Under Chiang Kai-shek American competition, mounting inflation, police attacks on workers, were making a chaos of production in these mills. Now in the mills the atmosphere is cheerful and busy. Wages, real wages, are up by 50 per cent. and conditions have wonderfully improved. Elected workers' representatives sit on the factory committees and have, even in the privately-owned factory, a decisive say in their running. Production constantly mounts, assisted by workers' inventions and developments of new techniques.

Industry in East China is also expanding. We visited one entirely new factory, manufacturing a new line for China—jute. The machinery had been imported by Chiang before the Japanese war but he had never built the factory; and the machinery and machine parts, before liberation, were scattered over half China. Now they have been reassembled and the missing spare parts made in China and there a splendid factory stands—well designed, well built, good lay-out, plenty of light and air, every device to protect the workers from dust and otherwise preserve their health, good hostels, a nice restaurant, library, nursery, hospital, sports ground, meeting hall and the like, all built in the last few months and still expanding—the first factory on what will become a new industrial locality.

We visited an engineering works. Here they were assembling automatic looms. Production had almost doubled since liberation. More significant still, we saw China-produced lathes and cutters, made for the first time in the post-liberation period. In the Shanghai engineering shops have been built many hydraulic devices for the great Huai river project, though none of them had had any exper-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ience of this sort of work before. Coal from the expanding mines of Huainan and elsewhere feeds expanding industries. Anthracite—and the inventiveness of Chinese engineers—enables Shanghai's buses to run without any imported petrol. The power station now runs on coal, not imported oil. The workers and people of Shanghai have more than defeated the American embargo. The remaining foreign residents in that city may be pinched through the lack of imported foreign luxuries, but this is the only shortage of consumption goods. Old established British trading concerns may be driven to bankruptcy by the American embargo (one went into liquidation while we were there). But China and Chinese industry go ahead. Workers who, before liberation, could hardly afford one cotton suit a year can now buy four such suits a year. All the people we saw had adequate clothes whether in town or country—and 99 per cent. had shoes—cotton, rubber or leather, a phenomenal advance for China. While in the United States and Britain prices of consumers' goods have soared in this past year, in China they have remained stable.

To understand how the American war in Korea has affected China one must understand the preliminary phases of aggressive American policy in the Far East. The civil war in China was won by the people in war against an enemy armed, equipped and financed by the United States. That enemy murdered university professors and students, sent American tanks into factories to shoot down striking workers, and stood on one side to allow Chinese-owned factories to be driven into bankruptcy by American competition. This in addition to waging war up and down China against the people. When the Chinese people had at last liberated their country from Chiang Kai-shek, the American government assisted the latter to blockade the China coast in an attempt to starve Shanghai and other cities into submission. When that failed American planes, flown by Chiang Kai-shek pilots, raided Shanghai from Formosa, killing many Chinese people. When therefore the Americans began their war in Korea, and President Truman simultaneously ordered the American fleet to seize Formosa and American arms to be sent to the French fighting against the People's Republic of Viet Nam, everyone knew that a triple drive against China had begun.

When American planes based on Korea began to bomb the Chinese city of Antung and other Chinese places along the Yalu river and American troops drove up to the very borders of China

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there was no holding the eagerness of the Chinese people to resist this fresh onslaught of imperialism. Korea was the traditional route for the invasion of China from Japan, now an American military base, and the obvious wisdom of resisting the enemy before he had actually invaded the Chinese mainland appealed to all. The youth volunteered in their thousands and tens of thousands. In Tsinghua University, which we visited, over 80 per cent. had volunteered though only a few had been accepted. The workers and engineers in the factories fell to with greater will to push up production. In every factory we visited the workers told of the patriotic compact they had drawn up after discussion in that factory and all had signed, pledging, in addition to gifts and collections for the Volunteers and the Korean people, increased production and increased efforts to eliminate waste. By the beginning of July this year the Chinese people had collected enough to buy 2,000 planes for the Volunteers, apart from other items of heavy equipment.

In the countryside the determination to resist America and aid Korea has had similar practical results. It had been planned to carry through land reform last winter and spring in areas with a population of 100 million. In fact the peasants carried it through in areas with a population of 130 million, including some parts of south-west China which were among the last to be liberated. Now land reform has in the main been completed and next winter and spring, except for the smaller nationality areas, it will have been fundamentally completed. The single act of dividing up the landlords' estates has doubled the incomes of many peasants as well as giving them additional incentive to increase their output now the land and its crops belong to them. But they have done much more than this. In Hopei province, where we went to see the effect of land reform, there was formerly never enough grown to feed the people of the province. It was always a deficit area. Now it is no longer deficit but grows sufficient for all its people. With the help of the People's Provincial Government old dykes are being cleared and new ones dug, new wells are being sunk to tap rich underground water, and more and more of the peasants are working in mutual aid teams to speed ploughing, sowing and harvesting. The great Huai river project which, when completed, will eliminate floods from an area with a population of over ten million is but one example, albeit the largest, of what is happening all over China as the people wake to life and begin to build their own prosperous

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

future. Three million peasants were at work on this project while we were in China. So much for the reliability of the *New York Times*!

Resisting American aggression has economically strengthened China. Politically, though the two cannot be divorced, it has done even more. At the end of last year, it was freely admitted in China, counter-revolutionary forces which were trying to co-ordinate their activities with those of the American army in Korea, had some strength. In south-west China 10,000 people—peasants and government workers—were killed by the counter-revolutionaries. In various places sabotage was attempted. But the bulk of these counter-revolutionary forces has now been smashed and rounded up and they were already basically defeated at the beginning of this year. But while the counter-revolutionaries, coming out of their hiding places to help the American drive to China's northern frontiers, were rounded up, millions and tens of millions of Chinese people were waking to political life in the struggle against them and against American aggression. This awakening of the people is the most basic fact in China. When we went to the Huainan mines, the miners in their thousands would not go down the pit till they had heard the British miner, Jock Kane, speak. In the crowd one could see some of them holding up their children to get a glimpse of him speaking, standing on a table under an acacia tree at the pit head. Their wives and families and men off work lined the route to the pit. When Harry Watson, London lighterman, went to Tientsin docks the dockers gave him a mass reception. With Esther Henrotte, I went to a recently-formed factory co-operative society in the back streets of Tientsin. Children and housewives came from all around to see us. They cheered enthusiastically Esther's farewell speech. One could see with what appreciation they followed her words.

Everywhere one went there was the same sense of people actively participating in affairs: a meeting to hear the reports of citizens of Antung on the American bombing of their town; a visit to a university or workers' club; peasants in a mutual aid team watering their land; looking at workers' drawings and water colours; watching young miners and miners' daughters dancing in their new concert hall. And everywhere the happy, eager, expectant faces of the children, especially the Young Pioneers. The people of China have most definitely stood up, and are continually awakening to life. And this awakening is going on and on continuously, widening and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An Important

THE present extremely rapid rise in all the costs of production of this magazine confronts us and our readers with a serious problem. Below we give the facts.

With the ending of paper restrictions the LABOUR MONTHLY *was enabled in the spring of last year to return to the same sort of paper, size and format as in pre-war days. Scarcely had this been done when* **the price of paper began to rise.** *The Korean war began in June, 1950.* **Paper rose in price.**

The intensification of the rearmament drive was announced in August last year and could be measured before the end of the year by the change from the additional £100,000,000 *voted by the House of Commons in the summer to an expenditure of* £4,700,000,000. **Again paper rose in price.**

The belated effect of devaluation of sterling in autumn, 1949, also began to operate. The total result has been a rapid rise in the cost of living in the last few months. Since wages in the printing trade are now geared to the cost of living index, printing costs other than paper have risen further. In July the **increase in the printing bill** *was 15 per cent. Moreover, on this item alone printing costs will increase to correspond with the rise in the figures of the Index.*

By the spring of this year the rise in the price of paper was such that the daily newspapers, faced with a six-fold increase in the cost of newsprint from pre-war, were forced, in spite of the subsidies given from advertising, to raise their prices by 50 per cent. Periodicals also rose in price by the same amount in most cases, sometimes also reducing their size.

In the case of this magazine, ever since last autumn only the Guarantee Fund kept us solvent. *In the last few months there has been nearly a penny loss on every copy sold—and it must be re-*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Announcement

membered by our readers that for nine-tenths of our circulation an average of 5d. in every shilling is taken by the distributors, wholesalers and others. Thanks to the Fund provided by our readers, we have so far kept the price down to 1s. With the latest price rises and with freight and postages up, this is now no longer possible.

We are therefore compelled—though with the utmost reluctance —to announce a rise in the price of 'Labour Monthly' from 1s. to 1s. 6d., but without any reduction in the number of pages.

This rise in price will take place immediately with the issue of September. But it will not affect those who have taken out regular subscriptions, nor will the full price be charged to new subscribers up to the end of this year. Those who take out a postal subscription or renew it, up to December 31, will get the magazine at 1s. 3d. per copy post free. (15s. home; 16s. overseas, if second class mail).

We understand the difficulties that this means for so many of our readers. We are most anxious that not one of our readers should be lost. Perhaps where there is a case of special difficulties two or three readers could get together and find ways and means to solve this problem.

In general, we have to rely upon the main body of our readership for their help in this and other aspects of our problem. It is to them we turn in order to get new readers, to keep the circulation up and to maintain our resources by regular donations. The risk caused by a rise in price is present, but can be met if each of our readers takes the necessary steps.

At this time of war danger we need not expatiate on the usefulness of our magazine nor stress the problem. We simply state it and make this appeal.

EDITORIAL BOARD

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deepening, bringing in new millions of people (for example the Tibetans, the agreement about whose peaceful liberation was signed when we were in China) and each new area when land reform has been completed.

Under the loud cry that the Chinese people were weak, the Japanese drove into China, the Americans backed Chiang Kai-shek's civil war, and later made their mad attempt in Korea to drive up to China's frontiers. All have been costly failures. Yet today the same propaganda, designed to lure Britons and Americans to a futile death, is still being peddled. The alternative is to recognise that People's China is a great power which must be treated on an equality with the United States, the Soviet Union, ourselves and France. Formosa must be immediately returned to it, it must fully participate in the Japanese Peace Treaty and be given its rightful place in the United Nations. The Chinese will not be bullied, they cannot be defeated. They know that to defend themselves is just. They are ready for Five Power talks. While we were in China balloting on the question of Five Power talks was going on and over 230 million people, or half the population, had voted for them when we left. But the United States, through its refusal to recognise People's China, and the British Government, through its subservience to the United States, stand in the way. Were Britain now to take a bold stand on the recognition of People's China and for Five Power talks to follow a Korean armistice, with withdrawal of all foreign troops, a much wider peace than just a truce in Korea could be won.

We were in China the day after her people had stood up. They were strong in their unity, strong in their conviction of the bright future they were building for themselves, strong in their knowledge that they had the power to defend their peaceful construction. Their message rings through the world to all peoples: ' Stand up too for peace and freedom '.

In view of the ever increasing demand for old volumes, single back numbers are most welcome. Of recent issues June and October, 1948; April, 1949; and January, 1951, are urgently needed.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PAKISTAN TRIAL

D. N. PRITT, K.C.

THE steady development towards Fascism of the 'free' world—'free', if you please, because it is capitalist—exemplified by the progressive destruction of all the bourgeois-liberal civil rights and safeguards (coupled of course with hypocritical accusations against the Socialist half of the world of destroying just those rights) has produced a particularly unhappy example in Pakistan, in the trial of the 'Rawalpindi conspiracy case' which began on June 15 inside the prison at Hyderabad (Sind).

The charge is one of conspiracy to establish by force a military dictatorship in Pakistan. The accused include, in addition to a number of high military officials, Faiz Ahmad Faiz, the popular poet of Pakistan, editor of the progressive opposition paper, the *Pakistan Times,* and the founder of the Peace Movement in Pakistan; Syed Sajjad Zaheer, a famous Urdu novelist and critic, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Pakistan; and Syed Sibtey Hassan, a well-known Urdu journalist and critic.

Few of the traditional safeguards of a fair trial are in force in the proceedings. Those accused of serious crime should have full and early knowledge of the case they have to answer. This is normally secured in Pakistan (as in Britain) by committal proceedings before magistrates. So, in this case, such proceedings have been wholly eliminated, and the accused have been brought to trial with very short notice and little knowledge of the charges they had to meet.

Then, trial before the regular courts, with their established procedure, and their professional reputation to maintain, normally provides at the least a better prospect of a fair trial than does a special court, set up by a government to try a particular case, with judges selected for that case by that government; and this difference is greatly heightened when the right of the accused to a jury, which applies before the regular courts, does not prevail in the special one. So, in this case, the accused are being tried, without a jury, before a special court, a court with no pride of ancestry and, one trusts, no hope of posterity.

Then, it is at once elementary and crucially important that accused persons should have proper facilities to defend themselves in court, and to make the necessary preparations to defend them-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

selves, including the securing of witnesses. These facilities, doubly and trebly important when—as in this case—many other obstacles to justice are present, include free choice of counsel, reasonable facilities for counsel to do their work, and reasonable opportunity for the accused to see their relations during the necessarily anxious period of waiting and undergoing trial. So, in this case, the choice of counsel has been subjected to the veto of the special court; the counsel ultimately allotted are not allowed to take notes, or to take the papers away to study them, or to seek the advice and help of their professional brethren in the conduct of their case; no relatives other than those of the first degree are allowed to see the accused—and relatives of the second degree might be just as helpful and intelligent—and even those who do see the accused are not allowed to discuss the case with them. Relatives who happen to live in India have been waiting in vain for weeks for Pakistan entry permits to see some of the accused. How, one wonders, do men on trial for their lives adequately deal, in such circumstances, with the problem of preparing witnesses? How do they find out what witnesses can prove some point and whether they would be helpful and willing and truthful, or frightened? How do they even trace the witness and talk to him whilst all the time the trial is going on, quickly, relentlessly, and applications for adjournment are mostly refused?

The greatest safeguard of all is that of publicity. Every country, every jurist, agrees that the healthy light of publicity is as health-giving to prosecutions as the bright sun is to crowded mankind. Everyone knows, too, that there are cases in which the public safety demands that at any rate parts of cases must be heard in secret; but alas! we know too that, with increasing frequency, and in many countries, cases are heard in secret, on the pretext of public safety, when the real reason is that the government has a weak case which the sunlight would shrivel up, and publicity remains the great safeguard. So the hearing is wholly secret at every stage. Even the evidence is recorded only in summary form. No reports of the proceedings are allowed in the press, and no report of anything but the sentences will even be permitted, unless public opinion reverses this disgraceful procedure. There is one more safeguard that should be provided. Even with the best courts, the best defence facilities, the best traditions, the best morale, mistakes are made, and every country provides at least one, and most countries provide at least two remedies by way of appeal. So, here, where the accused are faced with every obstacle to justice, every possibility of abuse, that can be

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thought of, there is to be no appeal whatever, either against convictions or against sentence—and the latter may be death; the prosecutor, indeed, is said to have demanded death sentences for all the accused.

I can think of only one abuse that has not so far been applied in this case; none of the defence counsel has yet been sent to prison, without trial, for contempt of court. But the trial is not finished at the time of writing and this particular American manifestation of 'freedom' may be carried out before this article is published.

It is not surprising that, with this odd assortment of high military officers and of intellectuals being tried under such disgraceful conditions, rumours of all kinds are current as to what is really behind it all. The Prime Minister, Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan, has himself to blame if perchance these rumours do him an injustice; for he is responsible for the charge, the secrecy, and the whole abusive procedure; and he has poisoned the already somewhat foetid atmosphere by giving great publicity to letters which he claims to have received from friends, demanding that the accused should be shot out of hand, without trial, and by recently arresting dozens more of distinguished intellectuals! The rumours are of course manifold. It is widely known that Liaquat Ali Khan on his visit to Washington promised to send troops to Korea, and that on his return to Pakistan he had to be told by his military chiefs that his troops could not be relied on to fight the Koreans; and the rumour is accepted by millions that he is seeking by this trial to get rid of his military advisers, to muzzle the political opposition and the peace movement, to destroy the 'red bogy', and to prepare the ground for giving military bases in Pakistan to the Americans.

Public opinion everywhere must come to the rescue of the gagged public opinion of Pakistan, and force the government to stop this farce, and to bring the accused to a fair and open trial. Then justice will be done, rumours will either be dispelled or confirmed, and the trend towards Fascism checked.

In our next issue will appear a further instalment of 'Unpublished Letters of William Morris', introduced by R. Page Arnot.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FRANKFURT 'INTERNATIONAL'

JOHN GOLLAN

THE 'Socialist' International recreated at Frankfurt causes not alarm in the capitalist camp; but cordial welcome.

If the Second International was a stinking corpse what can we call this thing disinterred at Frankfurt? This is no International representing the workers of the world, if for no other reason than that the overwhelming majority of the workers and peasants in most countries are led by the Communist Parties. Of the delegations from the 32 countries 'represented' 13 came from the so-called Socialists in exile. They represented nothing but themselves and their American paymasters; for in Eastern Europe, which some of them claimed to 'represent', the Socialist workers had long since cast them off for the capitalist traitors and spies they are. Social Democracy in these countries is finished for ever, the working class has come together in united Marxist-Leninist parties. The rest represented the Scandinavian Social Democrats, the British Labour Party, the Japanese Socialists, the safe Socialist parties from a handful of colonial and semi-colonial countries, the Canadian Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and the American-subsidised 'Socialist' parties of Western Europe.

But the menace that the creation of this organisation represents to the working class should not be underestimated. This is a kept international, a creature of American imperialism and the Marshall Plan organisation, whose main aim is working class disruption, the dissemination of anti-Soviet propaganda and the preparation of anti-Soviet war. It is noteworthy that one of the main incidents at the Conference arose on the endorsement of the Western Powers' proposal to rearm Germany. It brought an ultimatum from the Schumacher Socialists *which was accepted,* that the condition of their support was German supreme control of the German armed forces.

While the usual lip service was paid to 'opposition' to capitalism, Frankfurt was a demonstration of the support of Right-wing social democracy behind the American war drive and the rearmament programme. The lead in this was taken by Morgan Phillips, Secretary of the British Labour Party. The reactionary imperialist policy of the U.S. Government he described as 'enlightened, progressive and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unselfish '. His aim and that of the new international, he declared, was to unite the ' non-Stalinist ' world, that is the capitalist world, against Communism. This was the political motive behind the re-armament drive. At the same time he was forced to admit that 'many Socialists are still obsessed by doctrinal suspicions of American democracy, that they fear the American economic and political system will encourage dangerous policies which may lead to war '

As he was making his speech in Frankfurt, several of the most important trade unions were demonstrating that he was not speaking for the British working class. In every conference fear of the consequences of the present policy and the demand for negotiation instead of war was the outstanding common characteristic. The resolutions adopted were a rejection, direct or indirect, of the anti-Soviet war ravings at Frankfurt. They represent a new and important stage in the struggle for peace.

If this was the case on foreign policy it was doubly the case on the consequence of rearmament. Morgan Phillips at Frankfurt called on the people to shoulder the burdens of ' defence ' expenditure. Conscious of the growing revolt against the rising prices and profits as a consequence of rearmament, he expressed the demagogic hope that no one in the conference would think that the rearmament programme was incompatible with domestic reform ' or with a Left-wing attitude to politics in general '. No amount of demagogy, of course, can hide the facts. As the Frankfurt conference was proceeding the British Government official cost of living and wages indices were published showing the greatest gap between wages and prices since the indices were introduced in 1947. And they are notorious for underestimating the real leap in prices. Gaitskell announced in the House of Commons a catastrophic deterioration in the country's balance of payments and the threat of increased economic dislocation due to raw material shortages. Professor Titmuss stated that social benefits had declined in real values by one-third since they were introduced as a result of price increases. And these were accompanied by simultaneous declaration of staggering record profits by each company issuing its annual balance sheet.

Far from accepting the spurious advice of Frankfurt, the union conferences were an open revolt against rising prices and profits; while new wage demands were tabled (engineers, building workers, railwaymen, miners and foundry workers) and sacrifices for rearmament were rejected.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Faced with the ever-widening gulf between the reformist leadership and the rank-and-file, the capitalist press in Britain hailed Frankfurt as a new means of dampening down the rising struggle. It was welcomed as a new ' bulwark ' against Communism and a reinforcement for capitalism alongside Wall Street's breakaway reformist trade union international. The declaration of ' Socialist ' principles adopted at Frankfurt presented no difficulty in the way of this reception. It was greeted as a ' basic change in Socialism ' by the Labour correspondent of *The Times* in a despatch from Frankfurt on June 30. The nature of the change, he added, would make easier the aim of association of the new international with the reformist trade union international dominated by the American unions. The American unions, he concluded, would ' find the new Socialism less of a hindrance to co-operation than the old '.

What was this new credo, which the entire capitalist press found so acceptable?

For the ordinary worker in the Labour movement, Socialism means a classless system of society which abolishes the exploitation of man by man, a society based on the common ownership of land and industry and the planning of the economy for human welfare. But in the new declaration, warmly supported by Morgan Phillips on behalf of the British Labour Party, all this is gone for ever. The old catchwords ' were abolished, gloated *The Times,* and the *Manchester Guardian* noted with the greatest satisfaction that the declaration rejected ' the militant slogans of the earlier manifestoes'. These old slogans were replaced by a Right-wing reformist Charter for the defence of monopoly capitalism. Planning of production replaces the social ownership of the means of production. And as if to be even more definite the declaration makes clear that ' Socialist planning does not pre-suppose public ownership of all the means of production '. The economic structure of the country concerned, it goes on, ' must decide the extent of public ownership and the forms of planning to apply '.

There is not a single word here to which monopoly capitalism could take exception. The State capitalist trusts, dominated by the representatives of big business, and the so-called economic controls, passed off by the Labour leaders as nationalisation and Socialism, are of a pattern increasingly found in every capitalist state following on the economic development in two world wars. And so *The Times* in its leading article could comment:

> Socialism as it is here stated differs in degree rather than in kind from

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the policies of other democratic parties in the countries of western Europe and elsewhere which have reached a comparable stage of development (2.7.51.)

The union conferences of course did not debate any general declaration of Socialist principles. But their whole proceedings were a demonstration of the fact that, while the new Frankfurt 'socialism' is acceptable to *The Times*, millions of workers are increasingly realising that it has nothing in common with Socialism. The need to fight for wages, for holidays with pay, better social services, against employers' victimisation—the essence of the trade union struggle against capitalism—was the same at these conferences under a Labour Government as at previous conferences under Tory Governments. And whether the industry was nationalised or not, the problems were fundamentally the same.

The Frankfurt declaration could claim that its aim was the abolition of the exploitation of man by man and that in some countries, meaning Britain, 'the foundations of a Socialist society have already been laid'. The discussions in the union conferences in the industries already nationalised were a complete rejection of these hypocritical statements.

In the eyes of the Labour Party leadership the Frankfurt declaration really means that nationalisation is now finished as Labour policy in Britain. But this is not the view of the trade unions. The engineering unions demanded the nationalisation of the most important sections of their industry and the N.F.B.T.O. unanimously decided that building be nationally owned. Since the day that coal, transport and the other services were nationalised, the unions have made a ceaseless criticism of the whole administrative set-up and its complete domination by the ex-owners and the State bureaucracy. In spite of that, the Frankfurt declaration, to quote *The Times* again, 'concedes no more than that "the workers must be associated democratically with the direction of their industry" '.

Every declaration by the Labour leadership shows how wide the gap is growing between what they want and what the workers want. The Frankfurt declaration is no exception.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OPEN LETTER TO A JOURNALIST IN WEST BERLIN

JOHN PEET

(formerly Reuter's chief correspondent in Berlin)

Dear Colleague,

Could I ask you to stop being a journalist for just a few minutes? I know you always read the *Berliner Zeitung* through after your breakfast, looking carefully for sentences you can tear from their context and use to make a ' story ', or for articles criticizing mistakes which you can then quote to ' prove ' that the German Democratic Republic is on the edge of breakdown. I do not think that you do this because you are a bad person at heart. It is simply your job, you are paid to do it, and if you do it well and provide enough sensational stories you will get paid more. But please stop reading the paper in this frame of mind for just a few minutes and read it as a human being. Remember for once that you are a husband who loves his wife and children, that a few years ago you had to be a soldier and you do not want to be a soldier again.

Just a year ago I had the privilege of telling a press conference in the Democratic Sector of Berlin that I could no longer go on serving as the Chief Berlin Correspondent of Reuter's because it had become clear to me that in this job I was simply serving the interests of the warmongers. A few weeks ago one of my former colleagues told me that he had heard I wanted to ' flee to the west ' and that he would be glad to smooth the way for me. I should like to take this opportunity of telling him and you and all my former colleagues that nothing is farther from my mind. A year of work, travel and recreation in the German Democratic Republic has proved to me beyond all shadow of doubt that the danger to peace, the danger to humanity comes from the west, from American imperialism.

Although you have been sitting in the hothouse atmosphere of west Berlin during these twelve months instead of in the invigorating atmosphere of a new Germany in construction, it must have struck you how the American imperialists have thrown off the mask. A year ago there may have still been some excuse for not seeing the full gravity of the situation. Since then Korea has been ravaged by an American war, American occupation troops in West

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Germany have been greatly strengthened, American pressure has forced the British, French and other west European governments to agree to West German rearmament. That is only a fragment of the developments in the past year.

But we do not need to go far to find examples. Has not the development of the situation in Germany in connection with the plebiscite against remilitarisation been enough to show you what a danger there is, and where this danger comes from? In East Germany, in the Democratic Republic, the plebiscite was carried through by the state, and everyone was not only allowed but encouraged to show the German rejection of militarism by voting. In the west, Adenauer has illegally forbidden the plebiscite, and his police are doing everything they can to stop Germans from showing that they want to live in peace.

The excuse put forward by Adenauer and Reuter is of course that the whole plebiscite is a ' Communist plot '. If they had really wanted to avoid this ' Communist plot ' becoming popular, nothing would have been more easy. All it needed was that Adenauer himself conducted a plebiscite on the question of remilitarisation. This course he could not do, since he had already promised the Americans to provide them with cheap German cannon fodder, and he knew in advance that the people would say ' no ' to remilitarisation if they were asked.

But I do not want to lose myself in a leading article. I want to tell you what I have seen and learnt here in the German Democratic Republic. I have travelled 40,000 kilometres by car and train to every corner of the Republic, much of the time alone, and always able to see what I wanted to see. I have seen a new Germany with a new spirit which is hard even to imagine when one sits in West Berlin or West Germany amidst the memories of a dark past and the foreboding shadows of a black future. I have had long discussion with German youth who are by no means the regimented robots which you and other western journalists tend to suggest, but mentally lively to a degree which makes it very dangerous to discuss with them if one is not quite sure what one is talking about.

At this point I imagine that you are sitting back shaking your head and saying ' But Peet always used to be a cynic. I cannot believe that he is writing this sentimental enthusiastic nonsense. And anyway what about the People's Police? What about the slaves in the uranium mines at Aue '?

First of all I must tell you that it is impossible to remain a cynic

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when you see the *elan* with which the young people here (and many of the old people, too) tear into their jobs, confident that they are building something better than Germany has ever known before. As to your question about the People's Police. I can only tell you that in all my journeys through the Republic I have never seen any of the 'camouflaged soldiers' the western papers are so fond of talking about, and have seen no trace of police being trained with tanks or artillery. On the contrary I have met police who for the first time in German history are for the people and of the people, the politest police I have ever met, without exception, but at the same time fully capable of handling the difficult tasks imposed on them by the presence in west Germany of dozens of centres sending out spies and saboteurs.

And the slaves at Aue? I addressed a big peace meeting last autumn in a little town near Aue, and most of the audience were miners. The British authorities in West Berlin had just published an 'eye-witness report' on the mines, with the usual stories of slaves shackled hand and foot, wages so low that you could buy nothing, and so on. I simply read extracts of this report to the miners, and had a success which any comedian would envy. Several members of the audience fell off their chairs because they laughed so hard. A few days later I repeated the performance at Sussnitz, a holiday resort on the Baltic coast reserved exclusively for these 'slaves'.

Do you ever stop to think what is the reason and what is the result of the lies which you help create and spread? Not only the big lies but the little personal ones like the odd little report in January that I had been sent to a lunatic asylum. Why does your editor print that sort of story but not the more or less serious story which even you send him occasionally? Stop and think about it now. Every little lie which you pass on is another little knot in the big net which the American imperialists are spreading to catch the people.

In Spring, 1947, in Warsaw I interviewed a man who was sitting in the death cell waiting to be executed. He was Rudolf Hoess, former commandant of Auschwitz concentration camp, who had been sentenced to death for war crimes consisting of murdering several million people. I asked him what had made him carry out this frightful crime. He shrugged his shoulders and said 'It was my job, I did not really mean any harm'.

'Our job' is not enough. It is time that we faced the truth.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MESSAGES OF GREETING

From S. O. Davies, M.P.

My congratulations to the *Labour Monthly* on its 30th birthday, and my sincere hope that it has yet to come many more years to serve our working-class movement. Never in its history has it been more necessary than at present. I well remember its beginnings when conflicting Imperialist Powers were grappling one with the other in their penultimate struggle for world domination and for their existence. Most of them, thanks to the resurgence of the oppressed peoples in many parts of the world, have by now been either destroyed or reduced to mere ghosts of their former power.

We are now in the final stage of Imperialism. America, ignobly bowing to the dictates of Wall Street, is its last citadel. This colossus, conscious of the fate that has overwhelmed its predecessors in other parts of the world, senses that the same Nemesis that destroyed them is relentlessly pursuing itself to a similar doom. In the name of freedom, justice, and all the hypocritical protestations culled from the rhetorical armoury of Imperialism it now lures to their complete extinction the remaining wraiths of past Imperialist Powers. At the same time it sets out, and successfully so, to destroy freedom and justice in its own land, and to organise the destruction of whole nations aspiring for the right to order and determine their own destinies. Let there be no doubt in the minds of any man or woman in this small densely packed little island of ours that should the catastrophe now being prepared for by power-drunk American imperialists occur, Britain, America's principal strategic base, will be the first to be destroyed.

A long life to the *Labour Monthly*! May it bring home to our people more effectively than ever the dreadful danger now confronting us; that our alternatives are either peace and comfort in alliance with the progressive forces of the world, or death and destruction wrought by Imperialism in its sadistic final effort at world domination.

From Howard Fast:

Greetings to you and to the *Labour Monthly* of Great Britain. Your thirty years of continuous publication is indeed something to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be proud of. We in America understand only too well how difficult it is to keep a publication, a Marxist journal, or indeed any journal which prints the truth and fights for peace and for democracy and for socialism. May I extend to you greetings and best wishes from many American intellectuals who, like myself, recognise how vital and necessary such a journal as yours is to the very existence of mankind today. We greet you in the name of peace and democracy, and we join with you in the hope for victory over the war-makers and the merchants of death.

From Sam Kahn:

We in South Africa have learnt, I dare say even better than your readers in Britain, to recognise the true value of your journal in our common struggle. Here Marxism is outlawed, the daily news is sifted and censored to hide the truth, and the sources of accurate information and scientific political analysis are few and steadily diminishing. To many of us the *Labour Monthly* is not only a guide but also an inspiration. It renews our confidence in the sanity and integrity of the British people, on whom the main responsibility rests today for saving the world from destruction. It helps us to clear away the mists of lies and distortions in which we are surrounded and gives us courage to continue the struggle against South African Fascism. Long may the *Labour Monthly* continue to make its invaluable contribution to our cause of peace, socialism and democracy.

From Mr. D. N. Pritt, K.C.

My Dear *Labour Monthly*,

So you are thirty years old. You seem to me older than that in wisdom and maturity, but much younger in spirit. I think of you with respect and affection, and look forward eagerly to each issue; but I cannot easily determine which of your many characteristics appeals to me most strongly. I think it is perhaps your capacity for making a correct Marxist analysis of each new event and problem. If ever it were correct to say ' I wrote and told you so ', you would have to say it more often than anybody else. I have contributed to you a great deal, I suppose; but you have contributed a great deal more to me.

From Paul Robeson:

It is with a great deal of pleasure and pride that I congratulate you and your associates of the *Labour Monthly* and join in hailing

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the 30th anniversary of that great publication. I have an abiding and deep regard for the many thousands of honest and progressive working people in the mines, in the mills and factories, and on the docks of England whom I have come to know and love during the many, many times I have sung and spoken to them through the years. The *Labour Monthly* is the accurate mirror and mouthpiece of that nobler England whose great centuries-old tradition of freedom was created by the commoners, the workers of England. I know that they will not forsake that tradition, whatever the pressures of reactionary America and America's British lackeys. I know that the *Labour Monthly* will continue to point the way and press the people's advance toward the achievement of a world of peace and freedom for all peoples.

My warmest regards.

From 'Masses and Mainstream', New York:

May I take this occasion to congratulate *Labour Monthly* and R. Palme Dutt on the magazine's 30th anniversary. The magazine is for all of us here a priceless and unfailing source of Marxist leadership in our mutual struggle for peace and socialism.

From 'Tribune', Sydney:

Warmest greetings to the *Labour Monthly* on its thirtieth anniversary. Your magazine has, since its inception, been of considerable help to the Marxist-Leninist cause in Australia. Its publication of documents by the great leaders of the Communist movement, and its analysis of international affairs, have been invaluable. *Tribune* wishes *Labour Monthly* a long and successful life.

From Rabotnicesko Delo, Bulgaria:

On the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the foundation of *Labour Monthly* the editorial board of the newspaper *Rabotnicesko Delo*, organ of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, sends you its most ardent greetings. *Labour Monthly* deservedly enjoys great authority, not only in Britain but also in many other countries, being a tribune for defence of the interests of the British working class, a tribune of the progressive strata of the British people in the struggle for peace and democracy against the aggressive policy of the American and British imperialists, against

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the imperialist aggression in Korea. We are especially glad to note that *Labour Monthly* in its pages makes the truth known to the British democratic public, about the Soviet Union and the countries of People's democracy. The newspaper *Rabotnicesko Delo* wishes you, dear comrades, continual success on your path and in your struggle for the great cause of socialism.

From 'Rude Pravo', Czechoslovakia:

Rude Pravo, central organ of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, sends *Labour Monthly* best wishes on the occasion of its 30 years' anniversary. They have been on your part 30 years of fine struggle for international working class solidarity and for peace against the imperialist warmongers. We wish you much success in your further struggle.

From 'L'Humanité', Paris (André Stil, Redacteur en Chef):

The Direction and Editorial of *L'Humanité*, the central organ of the French Communist Party, sends its congratulations and wishes for success on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the *Labour Monthly*.

From Fred Celssner, Editor in Chief 'Einheit':

We send you our fraternal, militant greetings on the occasion of your 30th Anniversary. During the years of its existence your journal has proved itself a powerful weapon in the struggle for the emancipation of the working class. It has spread the theory of Marxism-Leninism not only among the working masses and all progressive strata of the British Isles but throughout the whole English-speaking world and has successfully contributed to its further development. We wish you all success in the struggle for the preservation of peace, the national independence of Britain and the victory of Marxism-Leninism.

From 'Szabad Nep', Hungary:

We send our fraternal greetings and congratulations to the *Labour Monthly* fighting with the vanguard of the British working class. The *Labour Monthly* has done most important work educating the British masses in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism; in the spirit of unwavering friendship to the Soviet Union. Today as in the past three decades the *Labour Monthly* exposes the criminal de-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

signs of British and American imperialism and the subservience and treason of their aiders and abettors the right-wing social-democrats. On its 30th anniversary we particularly salute the *Labour Monthly* as our friend in arms in the great fight for peace and wish you every success in your continuing work and struggles.

From Editorial Board, Trybuna, Ludu, Poland:

On the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of *Labour Monthly*, leading British Marxist journal, we send you best wishes and congratulations. Your journal plays a great role in the struggle of the British working class for peace and independence of Britain, in the fight for the interests of the working class and the whole British people. Thirty years of continuous struggle for peace, socialism, working class unity and international solidarity is remarkable success. We wish you many many happy returns and many successes for the just cause you propagate and defend.

From the editorial staff of 'Scanteia':

On the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of *Labour Monthly*, the editorial staff of the newspaper *Scanteia*, organ of the Central Committee of the Rumanian Workers' Party, send you fraternal greetings. From the very beginning *Labour Monthly*, which is distributed in all English-speaking countries, has popularised the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, mobilising the working class and the mass of the people for the fight against capitalist exploitation, destitution and imperialist wars. It has adopted a consistent and militant Marxist line in all social and labour questions and has exposed the anti-working class machinations of the bourgeoisie and of the traitors in the trade union leadership. At present the articles published by *Labour Monthly* and the pamphlets edited by its staff contribute to the successful struggle that it wages to unmask the hideous preparations for aggression of the American and British imperialism against the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies and to expose the overt aggression of American and British imperialism against Korea and China. At the same time *Labour Monthly* wages a sustained struggle for peace and understanding among the nations and makes known the achievements of the camp of democracy led by the Soviet Union. We wish the editorial staff of *Labour Monthly* new successes in the fight for world peace and for a better life for the working people of Britain.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Overthrowing the Constitution of the United States

Indicted in July, 1948, eleven leaders of the Communist Party of the United States were convicted on October 14, 1949, under the notorious Smith Act of 1946, which made it an offence 'to teach and advocate' and organise any assembly of persons 'to teach and advocate' Marxism. Their final appeal on the ground that the Smith Act is unconstitutional, being in defiance of the First Amendment and the Bill of Rights guaranteeing freedom of speech, was dismissed on June 4, 1951, by a majority of the nine Supreme Court judges. Two judges dissented. We print in full the short dissenting judgment of Mr. Justice Black. To elucidate some of the legal points which he states briefly, we include some extracts from the separate dissenting judgment of Mr. Justice Douglas.

Mr. Justice Black, dissenting, stated:

Here again, as in *Breard* v. *Alexandria*, decided this day, my basic disagreement with the Court is not as to how we should explain or reconcile what was said in prior decisions but springs from a fundamental difference in constitutional approach. Consequently, it would serve no useful purpose to state my position at length.

At the outset I want to emphasize what the crime involved in this case is, and what it is not. These petitioners were not charged with an attempt to overthrow the Government. They were not charged with overt acts of any kind designed to overthrow the Government. They were not even charged with saying anything or writing anything designed to overthrow the Government. The charge was that they agreed to assemble and to talk and publish certain ideas at a later date. The indictment is that they conspired to organize the Communist Party and to use speech or newspapers and other publications in the future to teach and advocate the forcible overthrow of the Government. No matter how it is worded, this is a virulent form of prior censorship of speech and press, which I believe the First Amendment forbids. I would hold § 3 of the Smith Act authorizing this prior restraint unconstitutional on its face and as applied.

But let us assume, contrary to all constitutional ideas of fair criminal procedure, that petitioners although not indicted for the crime of actual advocacy, may be punished for it. Even on this radical assumption, the other opinions in this case show that the only way to affirm these convictions is to repudiate directly or indirectly the established 'clear and present danger' rule. This the Court does in a way which greatly restricts the protections afforded by the First Amendment. The opinions for affirmance indicate that the chief reason for jettisoning the rule is the expressed fear that advocacy of Communist doctrine endangers the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

safety of the Republic. Undoubtedly, a governmental policy of unfettered communication of ideas does entail dangers. To the Founders of this Nation, however, the benefits derived from free expression were worth the risk. They embodied this philosophy in the First Amendment's command that Congress 'shall make no law abridging . . . the freedom of speech, or of the press. . .' I have always believed that the First Amendment is the keystone of our Government, that the freedoms it guarantees provide the best insurance against destruction of all freedom. At least as to speech in the realm of public matters, I believe that the 'clear and present danger' test does not 'mark the furthermost constitutional boundaries of protected expression' but does 'no more than recognize a minimum compulsion of the Bill of Rights'. *Bridges* v. *California*, 314 U.S. 252, 263.

So long as this Court exercises the power of judicial review of legislation, I cannot agree that the First Amendment permits us to sustain laws suppressing freedom of speech and press on the basis of Congress' or our own notions of mere 'reasonableness'. Such a doctrine waters down the First Amendment so that it amounts to little more than an admonition to Congress. The Amendment as so construed is not likely to protect any but those 'safe' or orthodox views which rarely need its protection. I must also express my objection to the holding because, as Mr. Justice Douglas' dissent shows, it sanctions the determination of a crucial issue of fact by the judge rather than by the jury. Nor can I let this opportunity pass without expressing my objection to the severely limited grant of certiorari in this case which precluded consideration here of at least two other reasons for reversing these convictions: (1) the record shows a discriminatory selection of the jury panel which prevented trial before a representative cross-section of the community; (2) the record shows that one member of the trial jury was violently hostile to petitioners before and during the trial.

Public opinion being what it now is, few will protest the conviction of these Communist petitioners. There is a hope, however, that in calmer times, when present pressures, passions and fears subside, this or some later Court will restore the First Amendment liberties to the high preferred place where they belong in a free society.

Mr. Justice Douglas, dissenting:

If this were a case where those who claimed protection under the First Amendment were teaching the techniques of sabotage, the assassination of the President, the filching of documents from public files, the planting of bombs, the art of street warfare, and the like, I would have no doubts. The freedom to speak is not absolute; the teaching of methods of terror and other seditious conduct should be beyond the pale with obscenity and immorality. This case was argued as if those were the facts. The argument imported much seditious conduct into the record. That is easy and it has popular appeal, for the activities of Communists in plotting and scheming against the free world are common knowledge. But the fact is that no such evidence was introduced at the trial. There is a statute which makes a seditious conspiracy unlawful. Petitioners, however, were not charged with a 'conspiracy to overthrow' the Government. They were charged with a conspiracy to form a party and groups and assemblies of people who teach and advocate the overthrow of our Government by force or violence and with a conspiracy to advocate and teach its overthrow by force and violence. It may well be that indoctrination in the techniques of terror to destroy the Government would be indictable under either statute. But the teaching which is condemned here is of a different character.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So far as the present record is concerned, what petitioners did was to organize people to teach and themselves teach the Marxist-Leninist doctrine contained chiefly in four books: *Foundations of Leninism* by Stalin (1924), *The Communist Manifesto* by Marx and Engels (1848), *State and Revolution* by Lenin (1917), *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (B)* (1939). . .

The opinion of the Court does not outlaw these texts nor condemn them to the fire, as the Communists do literature offensive to their creed. But if the books themselves are not outlawed, if they can lawfully remain on library shelves, by what reasoning does their use in a classroom become a crime? It would not be a crime under the Act to introduce these books to a class, though that would be teaching what the creed of violent overthrow of the Government is. The Act, as construed, requires the element of intent—that those who teach the creed believe in it. The crime then depends not on what is taught but on who the teacher is. That is to make freedom of speech turn not on *what is said*, but on the *intent* with which it is said. Once we start down that road we enter territory dangerous to the liberties of every citizen.

There was a time in England when the concept of constructive treason flourished. Men were punished not for raising a hand against the king but for thinking murderous thoughts about him. The Framers of the Constitution were alive to that abuse and took steps to see that the practice would not flourish here. Treason was defined to require overt acts—the evolution of a plot against the country into an actual project. The present case is not one of treason. But the analogy is close when the illegality is made to turn on intent, not on the nature of the act. We then start probing men's minds for motive and purpose; they become entangled in the law not for what they did but *for what they thought;* they get convicted not for what they said but for the purpose with which they said it. . .

The vice of treating speech as the equivalent of overt acts of a treasonable or seditious character is emphasized by a concurring opinion, which by invoking the law of conspiracy makes speech do service for deeds which are dangerous to society. The doctrine of conspiracy has served divers and oppressive purposes and in its broad reach can be made to do great evil. But never until today has anyone seriously thought that the ancient law of conspiracy could constitutionally be used to turn speech into seditious conduct. Yet that is precisely what is suggested. I repeat that we deal here with speech alone, not with speech *plus* acts of sabotage or unlawful conduct. Not a single seditious act is charged in the indictment. To make a lawful speech unlawful because two men conceive it is to raise the law of conspiracy to appalling proportions. That course is to make a radical break with the past and to violate one of the cardinal principles of our constitutional scheme.

Free speech has occupied an exalted position because of the high service it has given our society. Its protection is essential to the very existence of a democracy. The airing of ideas releases pressures which otherwise might become destructive. When ideas compete in the market for acceptance, full and free discussion exposes the false and they gain few adherents. . . We have deemed it more costly to liberty to suppress a despised minority than to let them vent their spleen. We have above all else feared the political censor. We have wanted a land where our people can be exposed to all the diverse creeds and cultures of the world.

There comes a time when even speech loses its constitutional immunity. Speech innocuous one year

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may at another time fan such destructive flames that it must be halted in the interests of the safety of the Republic. That is the meaning of the clear and present danger test. When conditions are so critical that there will be no time to avoid the evil that the speech threatens, it is time to call a halt. Otherwise, free speech which is the strength of the Nation will be the cause of its destruction.

Yet free speech is the rule, not the exception. The restraint to be constitutional must be based on more than fear, on more than passionate opposition against the speech, on more than a revolted dislike for its contents. There must be some immediate injury to society that is likely if speech is allowed. . .

I had assumed that the question of the clear and present danger, being so critical an issue in the case, would be a matter for submission to the jury. . .

Yet, whether the question is one for the Court or the jury, there should be evidence of record on the issue. This record, however, contains no evidence whatsoever showing that the acts charged, viz., the teaching of the Soviet theory of revolution with the hope that it will be realized, have created any clear and present danger to the Nation. The Court, however, rules to the contrary. . .

The nature of Communism as a force on the world scene would, of course, be relevant to the issue of clear and present danger of petitioners' advocacy within the United States. But the primary consideration is the strength and tactical position of petitioners and their converts in this country. On that there is no evidence in the record. . . In days of trouble and confusion when bread lines were long, when the unemployed walked the streets, when people were starving, the advocates of a short-cut by revolution might have a chance to gain adherents. But today there are no such conditions. . .

Neither prejudice nor hate nor senseless fear should be the basis of this solemn act. Free speech—the glory of our system of government—should not be sacrificed on anything less than plain and objective proof of danger that the evil advocated is imminent. . .

Book Reviews

ASIATIC REPUBLICS OF THE U.S.S.R.

Soviets in Central Asia. By W. P. and Zelda K. Coates. (288 pp. Lawrence and Wishart, 1951. 25*s.*)

THE transformation of the once backward, oppressed Tsarist colonies in Central Asia into the free, flourishing and rapidly progressing Soviet Socialist Republics that they are today is a leap forward for humanity unprecedented in so short a time and a vindication of Marxist national policy which is of the utmost significance for the rest of Asia and for the whole world. Yet so little is known here of what has been accomplished in these territories that the most ludicrous fables about 'slave labour' and 'red imperialism' can be put forward by anti-Soviet propagandists and Government spokesmen almost without fear of contradiction. Hence this book, which is in the first place the outcome of an extensive journey made by the authors, will be an eye-opener to many people and deserves special attention as an up-to-date account of a key area of the USSR.

It is an eminently readable and informative account. At the same time it is not just a travel book. It is in the best sense of the word a compilation, bringing together a mass of data both on the history of these Republics and on their present posi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion. The historical introduction occupies 67 pages and is necessarily rather slight, relying very much on extracts from the Encyclopædia Britannica and a few other authorities. This is followed by a chapter on the events of 1917 and subsequent years with the defeat of counter-revolution and the consolidation of the Soviet regime. This includes a number of interesting and not well-known quotations from Stalin, with whose name the solution of the national and colonial problems in relation to these areas is indissolubly connected.

The greater part of the book is devoted to a description of each of the Republics in turn, as they are today, incorporating much topographical, economic, social and cultural data with personal observations by the authors and many statements or interviews by authorities on the spot. It is impossible not to be impressed by this record of tremendous achievements and picture of abundant creative life, which is reinforced by the excellent photographs.

Noting the success of the socialist transformation in these flourishing Republics, with their modern industry, mechanised agriculture, vast irrigation schemes, their network of schools, universities and scientific research institutions, and their achievements in art and literature, it is hard to realise that before the advent of Soviet power these peoples were in the typical position of colonial peoples elsewhere, illiterate, poverty-stricken and exploited by the double yoke of local and foreign oppressors.

Reading these first-hand reports of their free and joyous conditions of life and labour, how abysmally ignorant, to say the least, appear such statements as that recently made by Mr. Dugdale, Secretary of State for Colonial Affairs, when he said: 'Whoever heard of Turkmenistan or Azerbaijan having the right to decide what sort of education their children should have, how much taxation they should pay, or what should be done with their revenue?' Yet in the Turkmenian Supreme Soviet, their parliament, there are 174 freely elected Turkmenian representatives, there are 20 Turkmenians in the Council of Ministers, including the Minister of Education, who controls over 1,300 schools, while only last March the Turkmenian Soviet decided its budget for this year, embodying also a number of proposals put forward by the deputies.

The Coates' book cannot, of course, cover all these aspects, and one which may be felt to be lacking is precisely that of the working of the political system of self-government. In view of the very title of the book, it is noticeable that there is no account of the Supreme Soviets of these Republics and their functioning, or of the working of the local Soviets, although much of such information is implicit in the reports of the authors.

There are a few slips in regard to topographical information. In regard to Turkmenian towns, after mentioning Ashkhabad, the book says: 'the other large towns are Leninsk, Kerki, Tashauz and the ancient city of Merv'. Leninsk is not in Turkmenistan at all. Actually, the second largest town is Charjou, the third is Merv (or Mari as given in Soviet atlases) and the fourth is Krasnovodsk. The first of these is mentioned on page 215 as Charjiui, while on

LABOUR RESEARCH

August issue includes:

'Rings in Rainwater Goods'
'U.S. Crime—an Industry'
'The Chinese Trade Unions'

Monthly 6d.; p.a., 7s.

LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
2 Soho Square, London, W.1

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

page 207 it is given as Chardzhou, which is also the name given on the rather sparsely filled single sketch map at the end of the volume. There is also an incautious statement on page 98 that the Kara-Kum desert with the adjoining desert of Kzyl-Kum 'form the largest desert area in the world'. This is far from accurate.

It is a pity that the price of the book is so high. It might have been worth while to cut out some of the less important quoted extracts from older sources if by that means the cost could have been reduced and the book made accessible to more readers. For many will want to study these developments which are a prototype of the changes to be expected in large areas of the world.

CLEMENS DUTT.

RAKOSI REPORTS ON HUNGARY

Report to the Second Congress of the Hungarian Working People's Party. Matyas Rakosi. (Hungarian News and Information Service. 4*d.*).

THIS report is a masterpiece of political portrayal of two and a half years of great changes for the better in the work and life of the Hungarian people. Rakosi reviews the international situation and contrasts the growth and development of the Peoples' democracies (calmly and confidently amid difficulties strengthening the foundations of Socialism in town and country, while playing a great and leading role in the Peace camp of eight hundred million people) with the imperialist countries where 'peaceful industry is more and more turned to the production of war materials'. In facts and figures he lists the economic and political and cultural development of the Peoples' Democracies and warmly extols Stalin and the Soviet Union for their ready and bountiful help during and after liberation.

He cites names of leading Soviet experts and workers in Science and Industry who have freely passed on their experience to Hungarian workers, in the building of modern factories, and the most up-to-date manufacturing processes. Rakosi warmly greets 'The Chinese revolution, the greatest step in human progress since the 1917 October revolution, and since the destruction of Fascism', and pays tribute to the amazing fortitude of the Korean people in their life and death struggle which is ringing the death knell of colonisation. America is finding it easier to subdue its capitalist allies in the West than it is to overcome with all its weight of armour and allies, the new-born fighters for freedom in the East.

The pamphlet covers not only the international and internal situations, but devotes great attention to the situation and development of the Party, and to the present task of the Party. I would it could be made compulsory reading for all who essay to play an active role in the life and struggles of the workers in Britain.

BOB STEWART.

FEW WORDS, DEEP MEANING

People's Democratic Dictatorship, by Mao Tse-tung. (40 pp. Lawrence and Wishart. 1*s.* 6*d.*)

'Our nation will never again be
an insulted nation.
We have stood up'.

FROM 1849 to 1949 is but a short space of time in history. Yet so vast have been the changes in China since the First Opium War to the first meeting of The People's Consultative Committee to make the above statement of fact possible. How has this change come about? What have been the motivating forces? What kind of State and Society is emerging in China? What will the new China mean to the world?

This fascinating pamphlet of Mao

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tse-tung answers these and many other pressing questions. The pamphlet opens with the great perspectives that now stand before humanity of a Stateless, Classless Society. Then the methods, the forms through which humanity will inevitably reach this goal are discussed. The ceaseless struggle of the Chinese people to wed Marxism to the mass movement is given in less words with deeper meaning than I have seen elsewhere. The present State structure in China, the main problems before the people and methods of overcoming them are set out lucidly. It can be read and re-read, each time revealing a new facet for thoughtful action. 'You incline to one side'; 'You are provocative'; 'You are dictatorial'; these and many other catch-penny phrases of enemy or faint-heart, get their reply.

Mao Tse-tung has the great asset of all profound Marxist writers—the ability to take deep theoretical problems and present them in a language understandable to the people without any taint of vulgarisation.

MARION RAMELSON.

SHORTER NOTICES

50,000 Outside the Law. (40 pp., National Council for Civil Liberties. 1*s.* 3*d.*).

THIS pamphlet reveals the extraordinary position of the citizen who is neither mentally normal nor mentally ill, but suffers from 'arrested or incomplete development of mind'. While an elaborate system of safeguards regulates on paper his detention and control, it is largely a closed system run by those who administer it, without the opportunity of public control. This results in the use of many defectives as a source of cheap labour, and a series of personal tragedies suffered by those who might be useful citizens but are particularly hampered in asserting their rights. It should be read by all those interested in the liberty of the subject, and especially by those who think 'freedom' a valuable slogan in foreign policy but are less concerned with its practical application at home.

JUDITH TODD.

Tribute to Alan Bush. (64 pp. Workers' Music Association. 5*s.*)

ALL who appreciate what Alan Bush has done for workers' music hold him in high regard. Those who work with him are filled with affection and inspiration and on his fiftieth birthday messages were received from eminent musicians including Vaughan Williams, Kabelvsky (U.S.S.R.), Riegger (U.S.A.), Eisler (Germany), and many others. These are published here with an account of his works.

Even where there is disagreement with his ideas, this in no sense diminishes their respect; and where agreement and understanding prevail it is clear that whereas he might easily have become an abstract composer, however successful, contact with the great working class has enriched the content of his music, made it simpler to that extent and yet of the highest standard. A heart-warming, idea-provoking booklet with a fine portrait of Bush and other illustrations.

H.G.S.

I Could Not Save Bapu, by Dr. J. C. Jain. (242 pp. Jagran Sahitya Mandir, Benares. Rs. 3.)

THIS account by a leading witness in the trial of Gandhi's assassins throws a powerful light on the rôle of the police as well as of higher ministerial authorities in the preceding circumstances. The author dedicates his work to 'those who are fighting against exploitation, the root cause of communalism, so that in future there may be no assassination such as that of Mahatma Gandhi'.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nearly 20 years ago one subscription copy used to circulate in an Australian unemployed 'labour camp' and was said to reach 200 people. That perhaps is a record; it certainly made a basis for the considerable readership there in later years. Today two subscription copies are studied by some 30 political prisoners in a satellite of 'the Western way of life': what a circulation we shall have in their country one day soon! If the Australian unemployed, if political prisoners could do so much, I know that British readers, however hard-up individuals may be, will see to it that readership goes on increasing. Because I believe that the vast majority of readers will decide, not that they can no longer afford to buy it, but that they cannot afford to be without it. In some places that must call for a lot of thought and collective planning: well, nothing but good ever came of collective planning, nor is there anything new in that in the average British working class home.

From the other side of the world came some dollars from 'two grateful New Zealanders. Long live *L.M.* and our thanks to you'. A fellow countryman now in Britain stands-in for Auckland 'as a tribute to the waterside workers of my hometown in their struggle against the fascist legislation of Holland and his tribe'. In Scotland we have two readers each paying to put Aberdeen in the steady money, which should finally dispose of the old calumny against Aberdonian closeness. I had a hard job picking the most meritorious winner of new readers for the Third Division: it finally is shared between three. The June fund total, which of course only includes some advance birthday presents, reaches

£41 5s. 10d.

Birthday Presents received up to June 30 from: 'Socialist', £1; S. Lawther, 10s; M. G. Baldwin, 9s; R. Rubemann, £1.

Stand-in Money came from: 'Billie', standing-in for Tonypandy 'in memory of Lewis Jones', 1s; D. Mayo, standing-in for Plymouth and Rottingdean, 2s; J. Tuckett, standing-in for Manchester, 1s; 'Scottish Airman' standing-in for Merthyr Tydfyl, 1s; 'Bath' standing-in for Aylesbury, Cardiff, Holmes, Warwick and Watford, 7s 6d; 'Islingtonian', standing-in for St. Pancras, 5s.

Steady money came from: J. Fraser, 'Aberdeen', 12s; A. Grant, 'Aberdeen', 3s 6d; Anon., 'Whitebirch', 1s; F.A.C., 'Horsham', 6s; P.O'H., 'Dublin', 2s; C.B., Bristol, 1s 6d; 'Swansea', 2s; 'Leicester', 5s; 'Bath', 7s; 'Islington', 1s; 'Belfast' (prepaid); F.C. (U.S.A.), for Cheltenham (prepaid); 'New York' (pre-paid); 'Socialist Airman' for 'Taunton' 11s 6d; J.F., for 'Central Edinburgh' (prepaid); K. and J.E., for 'East Edinburgh' (pre-paid); 'Red Sergeant' 3s 6d; 'Socialist Sailor' £1; 'English Director', £5; D. Mayo, 10s; J. Tuckett, 1s 6d; H.G.B., 9s; E. D. McCallum, 5s; 'Cambridge Seniors' 15s; U.S.M., 2s 6d; 'Debt Repaid' (two months) £1; H. N. Humphreys, 3s 6d; D. M. Clarke, 10s; G. E. and M. F. A. Philibert, 5s; B.F.B., £3, 10s; 'Homeaffi', 3s; A.F.O., 1s 6d; S. Morrissey, 10s; D. H. Strathern and Friends, 15s; H. Willcox, 4s; R. McLeod, 5s; F. Benouf, 5s; D.M., 5s; P. N. Brinson, 10s; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; H. Tinkler, 5s.

Other contributions include: F. M. Roy, 6s; J. E. Hilton, 8s; H. Lubbock, £4 8s; K. V. Cowburn, 1s 6d; J. G. Barker, 8s; C. Windley, 14s; T.D.C., 8s; A. Idle, 8s; P. L. Shinnie, 8s; V.G. (India), £1; R. J. Rose, 7s; B. H. Steel, 18s; M. K. Bear, 3s; R. Stubbs, 3s; J. H. Hone, 8s; W. Davies, 2s; W. Buchanan, 5s; C. G. Toff, 8s; S. Walker, 3s; 'Sarnian', 10s; 'Aussie', 5s; J.H.B. (Canada), 13s 4d; A. J. Salmon, 1s; P. Klonfleisch, 1s 6d; E. Midgley, 2s; D. Goodfellow, 8s; J. Sommerfield, 4s; H. F. Westnow, 9s; D. A. Thatcher, 4s; D. A. Morgan, 8s; F. P. Barner, 3s; J. Graham, 8s; C. McWilliam, 2s; F. W. Sutton, 3s; J. Walter, 3s; E. Williams, 8s; D. Russell, 1s 6d; Anon., 5s; H.D. (Canada), 8s; M.H. (U.S.A.), £1 15s; M.S. (U.S.A.), 7s.

THIRD DIVISION: 'California', five new readers; 'Labour Party Chairman', two new readers; 'London Engineer', again one more.

Our thanks to you all.

ANGELA TUCKETT

Co-op. Number L.99482.

134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY PAMPHLETS

★

GEORGE BERNARD SHAW

by *R. Palme Dutt* (1s.)

★

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE U.S.S.R.

by *D. N. Pritt, K.C.* (6d.)

★

CONCERNING PRACTICE

by *Mao Tse-tung* (6d.)

★

NEW LIGHT ON KOREA

by *D. N. Pritt, K.C.* (1s.)

★

Order from all newsagents

or

Dept. A, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3

SCIENCE AND SOCIETY

ESTABLISHED 1936

Volume XV, Number 3
Summer, 1951

HISTORY, MARXISM AND HENRY ADAMS
Richard Greenland

WHAT IS CHANCE?
Mario Burge

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE AND FULL EMPLOYMENT
Otto Nathan

THE GERMAN TRADE UNION MOVEMENT
K. Jurgen

A REPLY
Paul Phillips

Reviews by:

D. N. Pritt, Herbert Apthaker, Geoffrey Wagner, Martin Deisler, James Boyce and Giulio Muratore.

Quarterly, 50 cents Single Copy
$2.00 per year ($2.50 foreign)

SCIENCE & SOCIETY
30 East 20th St., New York 3, NY

English Representative:
COLLET'S LTD.
40 Gt. Russell St., London W.C.1.

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Dorchester and District Newspapers, Ltd. (T.U.), Dorchester, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED